

NOV 09 2004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: D.K. Dittrich et al. Examiner: Jerome Grant II  
Serial No.: 09/535,859 Group Art Unit: 2626  
Filed: March 27, 2000 Docket No.: BLD990050US1  
TITLE: METHOD, SYSTEM, AND PROGRAM FOR REDUCING TONER USAGE  
IN PRINT OUTPUT

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to Jerome Grant II of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at 703-872-9306 on June 14, 2004.

David W. Victor

RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

*Alcarr  
per  
12-12-04*

This paper is submitted in response to the final office action dated September 9, 2004 ("Final Office Action"), in which the Examiner allowed claims 17, 20-28, and 33-36, found that claims 3, 6, 8-14, 17, 20, 22-28, 37, and 38 would be allowed if written in independent form and rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 29-32, and 34 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102) or obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over prior art. The Examiner further rejected claims 39-52 as lacking enablement and indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, pars. 1 and 2.

On November 1<sup>st</sup>, the attorney for Applicants and the Examiner held a phone interview to discuss the rejection. The Examiner suggested a clarification amendment to the claims to clarify that the sub-pel region is less than a region of the pel. The Examiner said he would likely enter this amendment and would consider whether the amended claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants submit the suggested amendment and traverse the prior art and 35 U.S.C. §112, pars. 1 and 2 rejections for the reasons discussed herein.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 2.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 14.